



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,215	06/20/2003	Christopher E. Barnabo	END920030029US1	5835
26502	7590	04/27/2007	EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION IPLAW IQ0A/40-3 1701 NORTH STREET ENDICOTT, NY 13760			CERVETTI, DAVID GARCIA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2136	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/27/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/600,215

Applicant(s)

BARNABO ET AL.

Examiner

David G. Cervetti

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 11-14 and 16-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 11-14 and 16-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 February 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments filed February 6, 2007, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Claims 1-7, 11-14, and 16-26 are pending and have been examined. Claims 8-10 and 15 have been cancelled.

Response to Amendment

3. The objection to the drawings is withdrawn.
4. The objection to the specification is withdrawn.
5. The objection to claims 1-2, 4, 16-17, 19, and 21-22 is withdrawn.
6. Applicant's arguments with respect to the prior art have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. **Claims 1-3, 7, 11-13, 16-18, and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fedotov et al. (US Patent 7,197,751, hereinafter Fedotov).**

Regarding claims 1, 16, 21, and 23, Fedotov teaches

- a method for authenticating a first user in a protected network to an application shared concurrently with a second user in an unprotected network (**col. 6, lines 1-35**)
- the first user supplying a userID and a password to a first server within said protected network for authentication for said application, said application residing in a third network configured as a buffer between said protected network and said unprotected network (**col. 14, lines 25-60**);
- said first server determining that said userID and password are authentic, and in response, said first server forwarding to said application an authentication key for said first user and a selection by said first user pertaining to said application, said password not being sent from said protected network into said third network to access said application (**col. 14, lines 25-60**);
- said application determining that said key is authentic and in response, said application complying with said selection by said first user (**col. 14, lines 25-60**); and
- said second user supplying another userID and another password to said application, said application determining that said other userID and said other password are authentic, and in response, said application complying with a selection made by said second user pertaining to said application (**col. 15, lines 1-45**).

Regarding claims 2, 17, 22, and 24, Fedotov teaches wherein said application complies with said selection made by said second user without said second user supplying an authentication key to said third/ first network (**col. 7, lines 35-67**).

Regarding claims 3, 18, and 25, Fedotov teaches wherein said protected network and said third network are both / said first and second servers and said first and second networks are all / said protected network and said third network are both controlled by a same entity (**col. 4, lines 40-67, col. 5, lines 1-30**).

Regarding claim 7, Fedotov teaches wherein said selection by said first user is a request to said application, and said selection by said second user is a request to said application (**col. 4, lines 40-67, col. 5, lines 1-30**).

Regarding claim 11, Fedotov teaches wherein said application is an electronic meeting application, both said first user and said second user concurrently participate in a same meeting, and said first user selects a screen that is concurrently presented to both said first user and said second user (**col. 5, lines 1-30**).

Regarding claim 12, Fedotov teaches wherein said selection by said first user is a selection of an electronic meeting in which to participate (**col. 4, lines 10-37**).

Regarding claim 13, Fedotov teaches said application sending to said first server said authentication key before the step of said first server forwarding to said application said authentication key (**col. 14, lines 25-60**).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 4-6, 19, 20, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fedotov, and further in view of Roy et al. (NPL "Oracle iMeeting", hereinafter Roy).

Regarding claims 4, 19, and 26, Fedotov teaches using a firewall and protected networks (col. 6, lines 1-45) but does not expressly disclose using a Demilitarized Zone / wherein said third network acts as a security buffer for said protected network.

However, Roy teaches wherein said third / first network is a Demilitarized Zone ("DMZ") network and acts as a security buffer for said protected network / wherein said third network acts as a security buffer for said protected network (section 1.2.3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a distributed architecture as taught by Roy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to support collaboration where the parties are from both an insecure network (outside the company firewall) and from the intranet (inside the company firewall) (Roy, section 1.2.3).

Regarding claims 5, 6, and 20, Fedotov does not expressly disclose wherein said unprotected network is an Internet. However, Roy teaches wherein said unprotected network is an Internet (section 1.2.3). Same motivation as for claims 4, 19, and 26 above applies.

11. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fedotov, and further in view of Bhatia et al. (US Patent 7,111,323, hereinafter Bhatia).

Regarding claim 14, Fedotov does not expressly disclose wherein said authentication key is self authenticating based on whether a period during which the key is valid matches a scheduled period of use of said application, and whether an IP address of said first user is from said protected network. However, Bhatia teaches using such authentication for a distributed system (**abstract**). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use time constrained authentication with the system of Fedotov. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to support inactivity timers (Bhatia, cols. 1-2).

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2136

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David G. Cervetti whose telephone number is (571)272-5861. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday and Thursday-Friday.

14. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on (571)272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

15. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DGC

NASSER MOAZZAMI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100


4,24,07